IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MICHAE	L HILL,	et al.,)					
		Plaintiffs)	CIVIL	ACTION	NO.	03-323	ERIE
			}	CIVIL	ACTION	NO.	03-355	ERIE
	v.)	CIVIL	ACTION	NO.	03-368	ERIE
)	CIVIL	ACTION	NO.	04-11	ERIE
JOHN LA	AMANNA,	et al.,)	CIVIL	ACTION	NO.	05-160	ERIE
		Defendants)					

HEARING ON MOTION TO MODIFY CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

Proceedings held before the HONORABLE SEAN J. McLAUGHLIN, U.S. District Judge, and the HONORABLE SUSAN PARADISE BAXTER, Chief U.S. Magistrate Judge, in Judge's Chambers, U.S. Courthouse, Erie, Pennsylvania, on Tuesday, November 14, 2006.

APPEARANCES:

RICHARD A. LANZILLO, Esquire, and NEAL DEVLIN, Esquire, (via Phone), appearing on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

MICHAEL COLVILLE, Assistant United States Attorney; PHILIP O'CONNOR, Assistant United States Attorney; and DOUGLAS GOLDRING, Assistant General BOP Counsel, (via Phone), appearing on behalf of the Defendants.

Ronald J. Bench, RMR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

1

(Whereupon, the proceedings began at 11:30 a.m., on Tuesday, November 14, 2006, in Judge's Chambers.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE BAXTER: Good morning.

MR. COLVILLE: Good morning, your Honor.

MR. LANZILLO: Good morning, your Honor.

JUDGE BAXTER: I'm going to call the cases. Civil Action No. 03-323 Erie. No. 03-355 Erie. No. 03-368 Erie. No. 04-11 Erie, and No. 05-160 Erie. It is a series of cases that we refer in the office to as Hill v. Lamanna, et al., in regards to the silica dust issue at FCI McKean. On the

phone we have Mr. Lanzillo, are you there? 14

MR. LANZILLO: I am, your Honor.

JUDGE BAXTER: Mr. Colville, are you there?

MR. COLVILLE: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE BAXTER: And we have others as well?

MR. COLVILLE: Yes, Phil O'Conner from our office.

MR. LANZILLO: Your Honor, we have Neal Devlin in my office, as well as our paralegal, Lori Watson, who helps us with the scheduling here at the law firm.

JUDGE BAXTER: All right. I know that the way usually it works is you do a consented motion for an extension of time and the judge signs it, it pops up on your e-mail and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

everything is right with the world. But in this case we really have a problem with time. And you all know about that. know that you're busy trying to get all this done. I went and I talked to Judge McLaughlin this morning. And we tried to come up with a plan that will work for everybody. However, as you know, it's my job to make sure the plan works for him first. And here we are. We are going to allow discovery to continue until January 3rd. The news that might be most discomforting to you is that dispositive motions will be due that day as well. And we're only going to give you until January 17th to respond to dispositive motions. The problem is we have to get together, with the way the juries are planned, if these were only FTCA cases, that wouldn't be a big issue, but we have to go with the trial terms. Then the cases, if they survive or what survives, however, that works, will be part of the March 12th trial term. And I fear Judge McLaughlin was adamant about that. So I could rule differently, but once it was in front of him, that judge change. It just as easily could have gone to him to work this out as best we could. right. As far as the dental issue on Michael Hill, the judge wants to carve that out separately. And here's how that will work. Discovery will close on the 1st of December, that will not change as to the dental issue. The trial will be scheduled in this case, if it survives summary judgment, and the trial has already been set on his schedule for February 5th and 6th.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

So don't have summary judgment changes in that case, we'll keep those the same dates that they were. Since the discovery closes the same. Now, I wanted to get that all out of the way, now you can start talking for a minute and start telling me why I'm killing you and we'll see what we can do. Then, again, if it's okay with you, I'm a happy person and we'll just adjourn.

MR. LANZILLO: I don't know whether to go first or not, this is Rich Lanzillo, judge. Obviously, we will live with whatever schedule the court issues. That will be an exceptionally challenging schedule to make work, as far as on We are in the process of scheduling the depositions of Mr. Lamanna, Mr. Housler, Mr. Collins, Rob Bevevino, Marty Sapko, Deborah Forsyth and David English. And there may be some additional discovery that falls away from those depositions or rises out of those depositions. I know that Mr. Colville intends to obtain independent medical examinations or seek IMEs for various defendants as well. I guess the only concern is on the dental claim -- is that we would have to ask Mr. Colville's indulgence in helping us to arrange the Collins deposition very promptly, and there would be at least one other one we would have to schedule on an expedited basis.

JUDGE BAXTER: Is it my recollection that is only a Bivens claim and not a FTCA claim?

MR. LANZILLO: That would be an FTCA claim as well.

JUDGE BAXTER: So it's both, all right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LANZILLO: Judge, we do have some discovery outstanding where we're asking, requesting identification of a couple of the additional employees of the prison system regarding the dental claims. We have yet to receive a response, answer responses regarding the identity of those individuals, and then promptly schedule their depositions as I would have to work with defense counsel to try to conduct and include that discovery, also, on a very expedited basis.

JUDGE BAXTER: I understand. But it's also three years past, and it has taken a long time, I know it took a long time, Mr. Lanzillo, for you get on board. But a lot of this stuff could have been going before. Also, I wanted to remind both sides that summary judgment here has to be prudent. Don't give me stuff that is a factual issue or that you know is in I mean we took care of motions for summary judgment ahead of our typical schedule. We moved that along quickly. And I know you're all busy as well. We need to get this discovery done. And I thought I was very clear about that when we set the schedule. Realizing that it's difficult, realizing these people are all over the place in federal prisons elsewhere, we are trying to give you some more time. But I don't even think the circuit will be that giving, as it's been three years.

MR. LANZILLO: We will make it work, judge.

JUDGE BAXTER: Mr. Colville, you're very quiet over there?

MR. COLVILLE: I don't know where to begin, your Honor. With regard to the three-year period, let me start by saying Kelly and Siggers, I think it took them a year to serve us. We were prompt in filing our motion for summary judgment. I don't think there's anything that the government could have done in the case to make us to get to where we are now any faster. That said, and I appreciate that the court doesn't want this three-year case to be lingering for policy reasons that I think are now in existence with the court in the Western District, but I think given the magnitude of the facts, these individuals are being, these people are being sued in their individual capacities, they aren't suing the United States government or a representative, they're suing individuals.

JUDGE BAXTER: On the Bivens?

MR. COLVILLE: That's all this case is except for one claim regarding the dental, which has a <u>Bivens</u> aspect to it as well. While I certainly appreciate and understand and will obviously abide by whatever the court orders about the timing of this, given what I know about the case thus far and the logistics involved with getting depositions of inmates, who are scattered all over the country, getting copies of the medical records and the dental records and miscellaneous workplace records, and getting them to opposing counsel, then in turn

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hiring an industrial hygienist and medical experts who need to review them, in order that they may review the records so as to tell me whether or not there is a legitimate issue for the court to consider again, with regard to a motion for summary judgment. Let me stop here by saying I will not file a motion for summary judgment on a trivial issue to make this thing any I think I indicated that previously to the court at a status conference. But I believe that the key to our defense and the key possibly to a motion for summary judgment, which may resolve this case without trial, is testimony that the court may be able to get from an industrial hygienist and a medical expert, who will say one of two things or maybe both. One, this was not a hazardous environment condition at the UNICOR factory. If that's the case, and if there is no evidence to the contrary which overwhelms that testimony, plaintiff can't meet their burden of proof and the case goes away. Similarly, if the medical experts, after having conducted an independent medical examination of these patients, which I believe is a requirement in the case, I don't think the case can go forward without expert testimony from the plaintiffs, suggesting or stating that there is a causal relationship. If my expert comes in and says there is no medical injury which can in any way be related to the cutting of the Micore board or Locweld, then likewise the plaintiffs' case fails and it doesn't go to trial. I have worked as fast

and furious as I can in getting all of this done, and had a meeting yesterday with my pulmonologist, Dr. Gregory Fino. I'm sitting here looking at my computer screen, where I have prepared a motion, which I intend to file today or soon thereafter, asking the court to direct the Marshals to have these individuals transported to St. Clair Hospital for an independent medical examination. I have dates which my doctor is available to do that. The dates are December 21st, January 2nd, January 3rd, January 8th and January 16th. All of which is laid out in my motion that the court will then be receiving. The court may very well deny it and tell me I don't have enough time to do that.

JUDGE BAXTER: All right. First of all, there's a whole bunch of things you said.

MR. COLVILLE: I still have some more.

JUDGE BAXTER: Let me talk about these while they're in my head. First of all, a new summary judgment standard is being proffered there, it's not whether or not there is evidence that overwhelms your evidence on expert testimony, it's whether or not there is evidence that makes it a question of fact in dispute.

MR. COLVILLE: That's correct.

JUDGE BAXTER: Secondly --

MR. COLVILLE: Pardon me for interrupting the court, my point is with regard to medical evidence, if I proffer a

medical opinion, an expert medical opinion, I believe that the standard requires then for the plaintiffs to proffer a medical expert opinion saying this is an injury which was caused by the Micore boards or Locweld. If they're unable to do that, the case goes away. And I don't think they're going to be able to get a medical expert to say that. Now, I may be wrong or proven wrong about that. But in defending these individuals, I have to do this.

JUDGE BAXTER: And you're giving me a causation element in deliberate indifference.

MR. COLVILLE: No, this is a serious medical injury element --

JUDGE BAXTER: But the causation is an interesting comment.

MR. COLVILLE: Maybe I misspoke, your Honor. But they need to show an injury. Implicit in that or logically from that is the Micore board or the Locweld is what caused the injury.

JUDGE BAXTER: All right.

MR. COLVILLE: I guess my point is, your Honor -JUDGE BAXTER: Let me also ask am I missing
something, I thought these were FTCA cases, all of the cases?

MR. COLVILLE: No, they're only <u>Bivens</u> claims. The only work claim that is out there presently is a dental claim. As far as the FTCA claim, my understanding is the plaintiffs

are going to withdraw that with regard to three of the defendants, I don't have their names in front of me. Mr. Lanzillo can talk to that. And, again, I believe that's the cases that have been filed in '05.

MR. LANZILLO: There is a newer case, we had to do our due diligence on exhaustion.

MR. COLVILLE: Again, your Honor, these are individuals being sued in their individual capacity. If this was just against the government, I'd take it and bite my tongue. But I have to tell you --

JUDGE BAXTER: I understand. If you guys had consented on my jurisdiction, I don't give a hoot about the three-year list. That was your decision, but I have to go by the district judge.

MR. COLVILLE: Believe me, your Honor, I think we're all sort of here -- does the court want to try a case that hasn't been flushed out where proper defenses aren't given to individuals being sued in their individual capacity. Which if we force this, just for forcing sake because it's three years, that's what we will have done.

JUDGE BAXTER: I know the judge also feels like cases shouldn't be held in abeyance during summary judgment.

MR. COLVILLE: Is the court suggesting we should of in this case have had independent medical examinations of these federal inmates, who are scattered throughout the FCI prison

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

system and have them examined, conducted discovery, when what might have happened is that a motion for summary judgment would resolve the issue, and not cost any more money to either the plaintiffs or the defendants.

JUDGE BAXTER: What did you do in September or October?

MR. COLVILLE: In September or October we took five depositions via television. I went to Erie for two days. went to visit the prison to meet with my witnesses. copies of numerous medical records and prison factory records copied and put on CDs and provided to opposing counsel. in addition, I've submitted my own discovery to plaintiffs' counsel, which has yet to be responded to. I'm not even sure if it's out of time or not. But the point being that -- by the way, I have been in contact with OSHA, I have to get authorization from them to get the records from OSHA. engaged a pulmonologist. I have met with him, I have discussed the matter. I have copied all the documents and provided them I met with him yesterday. I'm in the process of to him. organizing the independent medical examinations, which I'm hoping the court will help facilitate, because I can't get any prisoners from South Carolina or Virginia or West Virginia, to my doctor's office without two Marshals accompanying them. First flying them to Pittsburgh, then accompanying them out to St. Clair Hospital, after having an examination. I don't think

there is anything wrong with these people, that is my position. I have to confirm that. And that doesn't even take into account that I have to have an industrial hygienist review all the reports and be prepared to testify.

JUDGE BAXTER: All right, send me a motion, I'll get these people there.

MR. COLVILLE: I prepared it this morning. I met with the doctor yesterday, he gave me I think eight dates. And what I've done is I pulled five of the earlier dates that he gave me, and I've asked the court to order the Marshal to coordinate with me and the Bureau of Prisons the transportation of these inmates to Pittsburgh, in particular, St. Clair Hospital, on five days to have them examined, X-rays taken and pulmonary testing.

JUDGE BAXTER: That's such a problem, I know it takes six weeks to get them anywhere in the federal system, to get them to my court for a hearing.

MR. COLVILLE: Putting it that way again, we're not dealing with the ordinary cases. And we're not dealing with an ordinary case in the sense there are prisoners involved and two individuals defendants who do not work for the federal government.

JUDGE BAXTER: I understand that always the case in Bivens cases, that's not what throws me, as much as it does, I mean having them come into one place for medical examinations

is going to be a nightmare. Can you hold for one second. 1 2 MR. COLVILLE: Sure. JUDGE BAXTER: I'm going to put this on mute. 3 4 (Off the record.) 5 JUDGE BAXTER: I just want you to know that I just asked Judge McLaughlin to come over to my chambers now. I gave 6 him a thumbnail of what you've asked, some of the problems that 7 you're encountering. Is everyone still on? 8 9 MR. COLVILLE: Yes. In addition, I brought Doug Goldring in, he's counsel for UNICOR. 10 11 JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Colville? 12 MR. COLVILLE: Yes, your Honor, good morning. 13 JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Who else is on the line? MR. COLVILLE: Phil O'Connor is in the office as 14 well, your Honor. 15 16 MR. LANZILLO: Your Honor, Rich Lanzillo and Neal 17 Devlin. 18 MR. GOLDRING: This is Doug Goldring, your Honor. 19 JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: This is in no particular order of importance but, first of all, I understand, I'm talking to Mr. 20 Colville, you have a physician who has to conduct a medical 21 22 examination on each of these plaintiffs, is that right? 23 MR. COLVILLE: That's right, your Honor. 24 JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: That would occur where, in 25 Pittsburgh?

MR. COLVILLE: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Has this fellow given you a date or dates upon which these examinations are supposed to take place?

MR. COLVILLE: Yes, your Honor, he's given multiple dates. As I told Magistrate Baxter, I met with him, he gave us dates that he's available. Half a dozen or maybe eight dates.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: In January, December?

MR. COLVILLE: December 21st. January 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 8th, 16th, 17th, 18th and 22nd. I believe I picked the earliest of all those dates. I put them in this motion which I prepared this morning after I met with him last night. Where I'm asking the court to direct the Marshals to coordinate with the Bureau of Prisons and myself in transporting these inmates that are scattered in various FCI facilities.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: They're all in different prisons?

MR. COLVILLE: Yes, your Honor. I would have them

brought here on those individual dates, to be subjected to, to

submit to a physical examination, have chest X-rays done and

pulmonary function testing done. Some of which I identify in

the motion.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Will each inmate be examined on a separate day or will they do it on one day?

MR. COLVILLE: What I've done is I've done them on separate days, only because the physician indicated to me that

the hospital would need one guard with one prisoner. I've done some preliminary work on their end and in speaking to the Marshal's wife, with all due candor, and she's informed me --

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Speaking with who?

MR. COLVILLE: The Marshal's wife works in our office, I spoke to her. Again, doing this with all candor, your Honor. She indicated to me the office policy is there have to be two guards. Having five inmates on one day at one hospital, I don't think it would work. I think it would work just as smoothly having one a day. Just to give you a heads up. Two of the individuals are at the same facility, I have scheduled them on back to back days. I presume they could be housed here, one could go on one day and one could go the other day, the following day or whatever the prison wants.

get them all done in early to mid January, all right, and the doctor expedites, turns around the reports, and it strikes me he's either going to see something or he's not. It would be relatively a report on either development. That having been said, my further understanding is if you get the report that you believe you're going to get, which you may get, which is that the doctor doesn't see any injury, then that in part is going to form the basis for a summary judgment motion, is that right?

MR. COLVILLE: I think so, your Honor. I think it's

an essential element of the plaintiffs' case. Without an injury, the case shouldn't be able to go forward.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Here, without waying in on one side or the other on that because I will get that briefed up and we'll take a look at it. If that's accomplished, if you can accomplish all that, why can't this case continue to move on the same inexorable track toward a late March, maybe the last week of March trial date with me?

MR. COLVILLE: We didn't discuss that, your Honor. We were going with --

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: I don't have a problem with you getting these people in and that motion being granted.

Incidentally, have you checked, sometimes for reasons that are beyond the Marshal's control, it's very time consuming, it takes a lot of time to get prisoners in from the four-corners of the earth. Have you talked to anybody about the anticipated delay on this?

MR. COLVILLE: Your Honor, I have not. What I've done -- without belaboring it, since we last met we have been getting volumes of documents. I met with my expert for the first time face-to-face yesterday go get the earliest dates he could give independent examination dates. This morning I had begun working on a motion to be the intermediary of the Marshal. I don't know what to expect. I'm hoping for the best, I'm crossing my fingers, quite frankly. Rather than just

going through the Marshal directly, I thought by having an 1 2 order of the court --JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Instead of going through the 3 4 Marshal or the Marshal's wife? 5 MR. COLVILLE: That was just in passing here in the office. 6 7 JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Get the motion in so we can get 8 those people writted and moving. Let me ask Mr. Lanzillo, are 9 you wrapping up your discovery? 10 MR. LANZILLO: Your Honor, we have some personnel 11 from the prison system that are no longer employees. Colville and Mr. Goldring are cooperating in locating those 12 13 individuals and making them available.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Has everybody been doing what you have been doing with the thought in the back of your head that barring a resolution of this case by settlement or otherwise, you're looking at a late March trial term, has that been on the radar?

MR. COLVILLE: It has been on my radar, your Honor.

I mean, I'm not happy about it, I mean I'm stuck.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Let's go off the record here for a second.

(Discussion held off the record.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Back on the record here. So that's the bottom line. I will leave it to Judge Baxter here,

you can tinker with your motion for summary judgment dates, in light of the anticipated medical exams. One way or the other this case is going to go then. Now, I also understand, I want to make sure this is correct, that the FTCA claims are being abandoned, is that right?

MR. LANZILLO: There's one remaining FTCA claim, your Honor. All others have fallen away.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: What is the remaining FTCA claim?

MR. LANZILLO: The dental claim.

MR. DEVLIN: Your Honor, Neal Devlin. I believe the vast majority of the FTCA claims are gone for a failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Were they dismissed by the magistrate judge or were they voluntary dismissed, what happened?

MR. DEVLIN: I believe most of them were dismissed through a motion for summary judgment or motions for dismissal. It may be three individuals, three individual defendants who had retaliation claims that, I believe the court didn't dismiss them, reserved judgment, said let's see what comes out of discovery. We're pursuing that in discovery, we've been in contact obviously with -- we've indicated to them if nothing comes of it, we will voluntary withdraw all claims against --

JUDGE BAXTER: A retaliation claim is not part of the amended complaint.

```
1
                MR. DEVLIN: Except for the dental claim, correct,
 2
     your Honor.
                JUDGE BAXTER: I believe that's right, they were
 3
     abandoned?
 4
 5
                MR. DEVLIN: They were, your Honor. Yes, your
 6
     Honor.
                JUDGE BAXTER: They're not involved at all?
 7
 8
                MR. DEVLIN: Correct.
                MR. COLVILLE: We have three named defendants, three
 9
     named defendants are lingering out there. It's more a matter
10
11
     of housekeeping.
                JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Let me just ask plaintiffs'
12
     counsel, is there a remaining FTCA claim that you continue to
13
     litigate?
14
15
                MR. LANZILLO: Yes, your Honor, that would the
16
     dental claim only.
17
                JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Is there a deliberate
     indifference claim as part of that case?
18
19
                MR. LANZILLO: Yes, your Honor.
                JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Let's talk a little bit about
20
    that dental case then.
21
22
                JUDGE BAXTER: We have the dates scheduling that for
23
    trial. We scheduled that February 5th and 6th.
24
                MR. COLVILLE: Both on the Bivens and the tort
25
    claim?
```

JUDGE BAXTER: Yes.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: So what I have is a jury trial and a non-jury trial at the same time?

MR. COLVILLE: Correct, your Honor.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: We'll talk more about that later. But for present purposes I just wanted to pop in and get a quick overview of where we're going here.

MR. COLVILLE: Your Honor, pardon me for interrupting, this is Mike Colville. With regard to the dental claim, we can talk about it later, that means we're still on for trial February 5th and 6th -- because, as the court may know, I'm involved in a couple other trials in your courtroom as well right around there?

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Do you mean to tell me, Mr.

Colville, this isn't the only case you're working on?

MR. COLVILLE: I didn't mean to sound like I was

crying, your Honor.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: I didn't take it that way. I can tell you this isn't the only case that I'm working on, either.

The dental case, what's the essence of that dental claim?

MR. LANZILLO: Failure to treat, your Honor. Just to make sure we're all on the same page with respect to that case, that is also a silica dust case. So you would be looking at essentially a deliberate indifference claim and the FTCA claim on that. You would be looking at essentially splitting

that case in two.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Isn't it anticipated that all of the silica dust cases are going to be tried at the same time -- why couldn't I try this guy's silica dust case along with all the other silica dust cases, and then keep the dental claim right there as well?

MR. COLVILLE: You could do that, your Honor. If you're asking my opinion, again, Mike Colville. That would be my preference. Obviously, to the extent it is a separate claim, we will look at it separately on the merits to see if it's worthy of settlement or otherwise.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: I don't see any point in making people try more cases than they have to. And so you know, the February 5th and 6th dates, forget about it.

MR. COLIVLLE: Thank you, that's sort of where I was going.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: We're going to try all these cases at the end of March. Now, how long is it going to take on all of these cases to get them all done?

MR. COLVILLE: Mike Colville again. I would tell you what I would anticipate as far as who has to be called. My medical expert, my industrial hygienist. My dental expert.

JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: This is assuming the cases are still around, obviously, but go ahead.

MR. COLVILLE: Correct. I intend on calling the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OSHA representatives who did the inspection. Obviously, the plaintiffs. All of the defendants. And there's probably about three or four witnesses who are either foremen or supervisors of the plaintiffs. That in a nutshell is the essence of the defense. That's not to rule out there might be one or two others. JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: What about the plaintiffs? MR. LANZILLO: Your Honor, largely a duplication of what you just heard from Mr. Colville. We will have our own medical expert. Our own industrial hygienist. The plaintiffs, perhaps some of the other prisoners as witnesses as well. JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: I know you don't have a crystal ball, between the two of you, how many trials days do I need to set aside for this trial? MR. COLVILLE: Sounds like two weeks to me. MR. LANZILLO: Yes. JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Does to me, too. JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: Well, I'm before I leave, has my Deputy Clerk given you a specific trial date for the silica cases yet? MR. COLVILLE: No, your Honor. JUDGE McLAUGHLIN: It will be sometime around March 12th or thereabouts. Let's go off the record here. (Off the record.)

(Whereupon, Judge McLaughlin leaves Chambers.)

JUDGE BAXTER: How many prisoners do you need to 1 2 bring up? 3 MR. COLVILLE: Five, your Honor. JUDGE BAXTER: Are you planning to do their 4 depositions when they get here? 5 6 MR. COLVILLE: We've already done their depositions. 7 JUDGE BAXTER: Have we found Mr. Lamanna? 8 MR. LANZILLO: Yes, your Honor. 9 JUDGE BAXTER: Have you done Dr. Collins yet? 10 MR. LANZILLO: Not yet, your Honor, we have requested dates, I think we proposed some for all of the 11 remaining defendants, remaining defendant depositions. We have 12 13 received all the medical records and other information we requested pursuant to our written discovery. Which I think is 14 what we needed to get our medical review done. And I don't 15 16 know what defense counsel's availability is like in the next 17 few weeks here, as far as getting the rest of these depositions 18 I think we have an agreement that we will conduct 19 them all by video link depositions. 20 MR. COLVILLE: I'll do them any way you want. 21 JUDGE BAXTER: Mr. Lanzillo, do I understand you 22 haven't responded to some written discovery? 23 MR. LANZILLO: I heard that comment, that took me by surprise, too. If we have written discovery that's owing, I 24 25 apologize, but --

MR. COLVILLE: I was not bringing it up to point any fingers, just to note that we had some discovery out. I think merely it's a request for documents. What comes to mind, what I remember is asking for medical records that pre-exists prior to these plaintiffs going to prison, to see what their prior medical histories were.

MR. LANZILLO: Mike, I don't have any recollection of that. When did you send that?

MR. COLVILLE: I'll talk to you afterwards.

JUDGE BAXTER: All right. Now, did I understand you right, Mr. Colville -- if the medical examinations do not go the way you expect them to go, there would be no dispositive motion forthcoming?

MR. COLVILLE: On that issue. We would not file anything on that issue. But you know we're also having the case looked at by an industrial hygienist, to provide expert testimony with regard on whether or not this was a hazardous condition which could have been known, had been deliberately indifferent to. We're in process of engaging somebody at this point. We don't yet have somebody, I don't think we will be quick in doing that. We'll be quick in getting them the documents. That's on my radar, as well as an expert review of the medical case, which is a pretty simple record, I think a pretty simple matter for us to get to the bottom of one way or the other.

JUDGE BAXTER: All right. I'm just trying to think how quickly I can do a summary judgment motion, that's what I'm trying to do here. Let's go with February 2nd for dispositive motions. February 16th for a response. And that will give us a week plus to try to get that done. Will you have to do a reply?

MR. COLVILLE: Unless there's something that is crazy, I don't anticipate that.

JUDGE BAXTER: I will not give a discovery deadline, you just get in dispositive motions at that point. That is basically your deadline.

MR. COLVILLE: Again, your Honor, I appreciate all of this. I think Mr. Lanzillo does, of course, as well. My only comments would be, I do think a court order will go a long way in getting the Marshals to facilitate this as quickly as possible. At the risk of stating the obvious, we are at their will. And if they drag this out or cause further delay with regard to the IMEs -- I'm going to do my best on that.

JUDGE BAXTER: We have dates certain for your physician?

MR. COLVILLE: That's correct, your Honor.

Essentially, what I'm saying in the order is they coordinate with me and the Bureau of Prisons to make specific inmates available on specific dates at St. Clair Hospital, and I give the address. I think I can work with the Marshal's office,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from my end it's really getting the Marshal's offices in South Carolina, West Virginia, Virginia --

JUDGE BAXTER: The other problem is where they're going to be housed when they're here. Because typically they house them in the Erie contract facility. Which is either the Erie County Prison or FCI McKean until they come to the Erie County Prison. That is under contract with the U.S. Marshals.

MR. COLVILLE: I thought they could hold them here in the holding cells in the federal courthouse in Pittsburgh.

JUDGE BAXTER: Are the holding cells available over night?

12 MR. COLVILLE: I think so.

JUDGE BAXTER: Our holding cells are simply holding 13 14 cells.

MR. COLVILLE: I don't know, I've not had to do 15 this. 16

JUDGE BAXTER: I don't think they are. The reason I say that is because when the renovations were done according to new C.F.R. regulations, they don't require them to be overnight facilities. I think the contract in Pittsburgh is at the Allegheny County Prison.

MR. COLVILLE: Okay.

JUDGE BAXTER: And then we'd have to writ them out of there to bring them to Erie. So unless the plan is to take them to FCI McKean and then drive them to Pittsburgh that day,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would consider that helpful.

```
which would be a difficult way to do it. They fly into Grove
City, that is where the U.S. Marshals fly into for this
district.
           MR. COLVILLE: With a March 12th trial date, is that
a date that you are referencing based upon you reviewing a
calendar?
           JUDGE BAXTER: In working with the Deputy Clerk in
Judge McLaughlin's office, obviously, he was not aware of the
dates that we had worked out together.
           MR. COLVILLE: Your Honor, it will begin on the 12th
and then go the next two weeks.
           JUDGE BAXTER: I thought they wanted some leeway to
take care of the speedy trial problems with the criminal cases.
           MR. COLVILLE: Then we'd be the first civil case
after all the criminal cases?
           JUDGE BAXTER: That's correct.
           MR. COLVILLE: The 12th would be the earliest, we
could be bumped back depending on what the criminal docket is?
           JUDGE BAXTER:
                         That's correct.
                                           Since it's a jury
trial.
           MR. LANZILLO: It might be helpful if we could talk
to our clients about waiving a jury trial demand.
           JUDGE BAXTER: I got to tell you, Judge McLaughlin
```

MR. COLVILLE: I think it might facilitate --

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE BAXTER: That's something to work on. 1 MR. LANZILLO: Mike, you and I can talk about it, we 2 can talk about that if it's appropriate and approach the court. 3 4 JUDGE BAXTER: Rich, when did you come on the case? 5 MR. LANZILLO: My goodness, judge, I don't even 6 remember. Initially in November --JUDGE BAXTER: Is it a year? 7 MR. LANZILLO: It may be, judge. 8 JUDGE BAXTER: All right. And, Mr. Colville, I 9 understand we have totally different views on the OSHA reports. 10 That caused the second group of dispositive motions, I'm just 11

trying to think when this got out of hand?

MR. COLVILLE: I don't remember. Doug would remember the chronology, Doug was involved with all the briefing up to a point. My recollection, I thought my recollection was it took a while to get these things served. They didn't know who to serve, you gave them time for that to The Marshals were a little slow in doing that. believe the Siggers and Kelly cases were my two cases. didn't have any other case until I got home from the pretrial conference, then I got three cases. After that we filed a motion for summary judgment or motion to dismiss and they may have filed an amended complaint at that point. Which then caused us to file additional motions.

MR. GOLDRING: There were actually I think three

rounds of briefing. The first resulted in a partial dismissal. And then we did a second round in the middle of that second round, I think is when Rich Lanzillo was appointed as counsel, and then filed an amended complaint in all of the cases. As result of the amended complaints in all the cases, our second round of briefing was mooted out. And then when Rich filed an amended complaint, then we filed a third round of dispositive motions based on the amended complaints.

JUDGE BAXTER: Which were quite, they were different?

MR. GOLDRING: Right. And then that's where we are now. That third round was decided and that's what led to the status conference earlier this year.

MR. LANZILLO: Judge, one of the problems when we tried to marshal all of these cases, get them on the same track, once that was accomplished while the motions were still pending, we were not permitted to take any discovery. While we had an extended period of motion practice, in reality we were working --

JUDGE BAXTER: You didn't sign a protective order?

MR. LANZILLO: No, judge. Under the rules, not

until the initial case management conference and prior to the
answer.

JUDGE BAXTER: He didn't have to answer at that point.

MR. LANZILLO: In terms of the approach taken by Mr. 1 Goldring --2 3 JUDGE BAXTER: Also, during that time, as I recall, the plaintiffs were being scattered --4 MR. LANZILLO: Yes, they were. 5 In lieu of the 6 motion, straight motion to dismiss, we had multiple motions to 7 dismiss, motions for summary judgment, which still tolled the answer period. So I think we only got answers to the complaint 8 in September. Which Judge McLaughlin, I know he's looking at 9 10 the case that's been --11 JUDGE BAXTER: He was also looking at it to see how 12 it got out of hand, looking back at the docket. recollection is I was so thrilled to have an attorney marshal 13 14 these cases through the system on your part, Mr. Lanzillo, I 15 was giving you extensions time after time liberally. 16 MR. LANZILLO: You did, indeed, your Honor. JUDGE BAXTER: But this would have been a very 17 18 difficult case with the plaintiffs on their own. 19 MR. LANZILLO: You were very accommodating. 20 JUDGE BAXTER: It was too hard to have the plaintiffs continue on their own, it was just too difficult for 21 the courts. And for the defendants, it would have been 22 23 impossible to handle that volley. 24 JUDGE BAXTER: All right. Is the workshop still 25 working?

1 MR. LANZILLO: It's not, your Honor. It ceased --MR. GOLDRING: It's been almost a year, they 2 3 switched over to a plastics factory. 4 JUDGE BAXTER: I can see that I'm going to be on the 5 phone with you guys very often in the next few weeks, and I'm going to have the U.S. Marshals on the line with me, it's going 6 to be the most difficult time of the case. 7 I'd agree, I think it will help 8 MR. COLVILLE: streamline the other issues, your Honor, it will be worthwhile. 9 10 JUDGE BAXTER: Tick off for me where the plaintiffs are right now? 11 12 MR. GOLDRING: Kevin Siggers is still in McKean. MR. COLVILLE: He's set to be released in the 13 relatively near future. I purposely had him scheduled first, I 14 have him scheduled December 21st of this year. I'm hoping and 15 16 thinking that he is still there. 17 JUDGE BAXTER: Mr. Lanzillo, the government won't pay for him to come back if he's out of jail. 18 MR. COLVILLE: I don't know where, but he's supposed 19 20 to go to a halfway house. 21 MR. GOLDRING: Released to a halfway house. 22 JUDGE BAXTER: Where from? 23 MR. GOLDRING: Cleveland. 24 MR. COLVILLE: If that's the case, I don't know you need a marshal at that point, so much as you do an order by the 25

- court to be here for the independent medical examination. 1 Which I'm sure he'll submit to. Somebody within the BOP may 2 3 need something from the court saying he is allowed to leave the halfway house for this event. I say that without any prior 4 5 experience of knowing. 6 JUDGE BAXTER: Halfway houses are even harder, 7 that's why I'm sitting here dumbfounded. Then you're going to have to take a doctor to him. 8 MR. COLVILLE: I can subpoena him here. 9 JUDGE BAXTER: All right. Go ahead, so we have one 10 11 temporarily at McKean? MR. GOLDRING: McKean, and at Petersburg. Michael 12
- Hill is in West Virginia, FCI Gilmer in West Virginia. And
 Leslie Kelly is in South Carolina.
 - JUDGE BAXTER: They're all south, okay. They're not in Colorado?
- MR. GOLDRING: Correct. They're all pretty close, at least within a day or two drive.
 - JUDGE BAXTER: They'll fly them into Grove City, I'm sure. All right. Have you hired your experts, Mr. Lanzillo?
- MR. LANZILLO: We have, your Honor.
- JUDGE BAXTER: Have you guys exchanged all that
- 23 information already?

16

19

20

- MR. COLVILLE: No, we don't know who they are.
- JUDGE BAXTER: You have one yet to hire, is that

correct, Mr. Colville?

MR. COLVILLE: Yeah, as we speak, I'm trying to get an industrial hygienist, I'm going to have a dental expert brought on board. We have a pulmonologist at this point already.

JUDGE BAXTER: You're not even going to mess with now, which is my understanding, about deposing experts?

MR. COLVILLE: No. We don't anticipate deposing any experts.

JUDGE BAXTER: Thank you. Mr. Lanzillo.

MR. LANZILLO: Having not seen the report yet, your Honor, I would need to -- just by way of example, exposure experts, should the defense have one, there are a lot of assumptions that can be made regarding the level of silica dust that was in the air. To the extent an expert is rendering an opinion regarding exposure based upon an assumption that may or may not be valid, I would hate to waive the right to pursue depositions. I will say this. I have no desire to take unnecessary depositions, I would hope that the next expert deposition would be necessary.

JUDGE BAXTER: Let me ask another question. You mentioned inmate witnesses. Have you found, do you have names and do you know where they are, that's going to be another nightmare?

MR. GOLDRING: We have names of those folks in terms

```
34
 1
     of --
 2
                MR. LANZILLO: In terms of who would be appropriate.
     We would want to avoid redundancy. These would be other
 3
     inmates in who have worked in the original facility or had
 4
     direct contact with our folks.
 5
                JUDGE BAXTER: All right. Is there anything else?
 6
 7
                MR. COLVILLE: Not from the United States, your
 8
     Honor, at this point.
 9
                MR. LANZILLO: Thank you, your Honor.
                JUDGE BAXTER: We're adjourned.
10
11
12
                 (Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the proceedings were
     concluded.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

I, Ronald J. Bench, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Ronald J. Bench